



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

are to attend Him at the great day of judgment, and who will then be witnesses of the rewards which He will bestow upon all them who now obey Him, and keep His commandments.

6. Another passage adduced in defence of the invocation of angels is Apoc. i. 4, "Grace be with you, and peace from Him who is and who was and who is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before His throne." We will make no observation of our own upon this, but give the opinion, first, of one of the fathers, namely, Primasius. He says, "From the seven spirits who are in sight of the throne of God, on account of the sevenfold operation of the Holy Spirit, his spiritual is said to be septiform—that is, of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and fortitude, of knowledge and piety, and the fear of the Lord," &c. Ambrosius Anbertus, a Roman Catholic writer of the Cistercian order, commenting on the same passage, says, "But when the Spirit of the Father and the Son is one and the same person in one Trinity, wherefore does John in this Revelation introduce seven spirits, except he intended to denote the sevenfold operation of one and the same Spirit by the sevenfold appellation of spirit? This is what the prophet had in view when he represented the one spirit of the Lord as resting upon our Redeemer, saying, 'The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him.' Presently into the one he introduces seven, and says, 'The spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of might, the spirit of knowledge and of piety, and the spirit of the fear of the Lord shall fill Him.'" But we need not go so far away for this view of the case. The edition of the Douay Bible published in Dublin, under the sanction of the late Archbishop Troy, in the year 1816, has the following note on this passage—"From the seven spirits, &c. The Holy Ghost may be here meant and so called, for His sevenfold gifts and graces, as some expositors think." The note then goes on to say that it is a preferable interpretation which supposes angels to be meant.

Now, with respect to the worship of angels, a word must be said. Passages are quoted from the Old Testament where angels are said to be worshipped; such as in the case of Abraham and Lot (Genesis xviii, xix). Of this, Dr. Delahogue, professor in Maynooth College, says, in his Treatise on the Incarnation, in the appendix, "It is very uncertain whether they knew them as angels, and, therefore, whether that adoration was not mere civil honour." We have already proved, by reference to the Hebrew texts of those passages, that no adoration was intended in either case.

Besides these, the cases of Balaam and Joshua worshipping angels are supposed to give authority to that practice. In the case of Joshua the angel said, he was captain of the Lord's hosts. Now, this word *Mal' (Sar)*, or prince, is applied to angels in the Book of Daniel; but it is also applied to Christ in the prophet Isaiah, where He is called the Prince of Peace. In the New Testament He is called the Captain of our salvation. Other similar appellations are referred to Him in both Old and New Testaments. Well, then, supposing this Prince of the Lord of Hosts to be Christ, it is no way wonderful that He should be worshipped; but if an angel, it is wonderful, indeed, and we should pause well before we come to that determination. The angel, for such we will call Him for the present, told Joshua to take off his shoes from off his feet, for the ground on which he stood was holy. There is only another instance of the like in the Scriptures, namely, where God appeared to Moses in the bush. In that case it was God Himself who gave the command. Why was the ground holy? Because it was sanctified by the Divine presence, in the same way as the holy of holies in the tabernacle and temple was sanctified by the peculiar manifestation of the Deity; in the same manner as heaven itself, the true sanctuary, is hallowed by the full and unclouded display of God's glory. Angels appeared on other occasions; they never made any such command as that of taking off the shoes. That homage is due only to God; and still in the East it is a piece of the divine worship. So that this circumstance shows that it was no less than God who thus appeared to Joshua. But in one of the following verses (ver. 2, cap. vi.), the same narrative being still carried on, this person is called the Lord (Jehovah), and He gives directions to Joshua about the taking of Jericho, as it was for this purpose He thus appeared to Joshua.

But, then, as to the case of Balaam, it is not at all likely that he either offered or intended to offer religious worship by falling down to worship the angel. This angel, however, might be shown to be God Himself, thus visibly apparent. Balaam intended to reverence the angel; but it does not appear that he offered religious reverence. Where is the Protestant that, if he were to see an angel, would not bow before him, and render him obeisance as a superior being? Yet, he would not be rendering him any religious worship. We have two instances in Scripture of religious worship having been offered to angels, and on both occasions they refused to accept it. These were the cases in which St. John was about to

commit idolatry, but was checked by the command, "worship God."

It has already been shown in the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN how dishonestly Roman Catholics have treated the passages of Scripture in which we read that the angels refused to be worshipped. To our minds such a refusal seems a sufficient ground for the rejection of angel worship. We are told that it may be because the apostle offered to the angel that worship which was due only to God. That is very true, because all religious service is due only to God: it cannot be given to any other without idolatry. Now, wherein consists the difference between mere civil honour and religious worship? Civil honour appears to consist, in general, in the awarding of praise to merit, the conferring of privileges, the ascription of superiority to any, the external acts by which our sense of that superiority or worth is expressed, and those various means of denoting esteem and respect which custom and the laws of human society sanction. Divine worship, which is properly all of religious worship, consists in the uplifting of the heart to the object worshipped, the reposing of the soul's best and highest affections upon Him, the acknowledgment and sense of complete dependance on and entire subjection to Him, the consecration of our lives and energies to His service, and the hope of spiritual and eternal good to be obtained from Him, through Him, and in Him; and all external actions of whatever kind by which these feelings are expressed. Each and all of these properly belong to religious worship, and none of them can be referred to any being besides the one God set forth in the Gospel, without incurring the guilt of idolatry. Now, the first of these, which we call civil honour, or that which one man renders to another, may be referred in kind by one creature to another, or by man to an angel; but divine worship, or religious service, cannot in whole, or in part, be referred to any besides the Great Creator and Governor of the universe. This worship is described in Scripture as one that must be in spirit and in truth.

We are told in the Gospel that the angels of God's children do always behold the face of our Father in heaven. Upon this expression Romish theologians build a curious and fanciful superstructure: they imagine that the angels perceive in this face of God all things, past, present, and to come, and, among the rest, the prayers offered to them by men on earth. They imagine this "face" of God to be a sort of mirror, in which the blessed spirits see reflected the images or ideas of things, and that hence they know these things. But this expression does not afford any authority to such a fabrication. Seeing the face of God does not denote the image of things reflected therein, but simply enjoying His favour, and living and being happy in His presence. It means, also, actually beholding the manifestation of the Divine Being, of whatever kind that may be. In a passage above cited, Jacob said, "I have seen God face to face." Moses also saw God, and "talked with Him face to face," and this while they were on earth; yet who will say that these good men saw in that face the images of all things, and so knew all things?

The Jewish high priest, when blessing the people, prayed that God would "cause His face to shine upon" them, and that He would "lift up the light of His countenance upon" them. Surely this benediction did not mean that they might see all things in that Divine countenance. So, also, St. Paul, when he said he should see God face to face, did not mean that the face of God was a mirror in which the images of things are reflected, but that he should really see divine truth, not through the veil of mortality, as now; not darkly, as through a perspective glass, but immediately and truly and without distortion or refraction, if we may use such a term in such a matter. In a quotation given above, Mr. Keenan represents St. Paul as saying that he should know God even as he was known. If saints or angels may know "God" even as they themselves are known, then there is an end of Godhead altogether; then they know God intimately and perfectly, as well as He knows them; then they are as much God as He is. St. Paul, however, says no such thing as this. The word "God" is foisted in by Mr. Keenan himself, and alters the sense considerably.

Peter Dens and Thomas Aquinas inform us that there are three hierarchies of angels—the highest, the middle, and the lowest—and each of these consisting of three orders. In the highest, say they, are cherubim, seraphim, and thrones; in the middle, dominations, virtues, and powers; in the lowest, principalities, archangels, and angels. As it must be hard for them to prove this, it must be equally hard for us to refute it.

We Protestants do not pretend to be wise above that which is written, nor do we pretend to be able to tell how the angels know things, or what things they know. We simply say that we know nothing about these matters, and, consequently, if we address our prayers to them we can have no assurance that they will be heard or regarded. We do not pretend to know how many angels there are, what is their power, or what is their occupation, and, consequently, we have no knowledge that they can or will attend to any petition of ours. But we know, on God's own authority, that there is One whose office it is to take our wants and our requests into consideration—One who always hears and even knows our prayers before we utter them. We know that He has power to do exceedingly

above all that we ask or think, and that His mercy and goodness are co-infinite with His ability. That saints or angels can hear or pray for us is at best a sheer uncertainty; that Christ hears and intercedes for us admits of no doubt whatever. And we do not feel disposed to risk a certainty for an uncertainty, to leave a sure and sufficient Mediator for those of whom it is most likely that they are no mediators at all. We do not dishonour the angels or saints; we rather give them the true honour, and what we conceive to be the only true honour; for any honouring of them that is not just we believe to be dishonour, because not compatible with God's will, and therefore not pleasing to those holy beings, who delight in that will. We will not put them in the place of their Creator, nor give them any portion of that undivided service which we owe Him. They seek no such service, nor would they accept it. They glory in being fellow-servants with us of our common God, co-heirs with us of one common glory, and participants with us of the same divine nature. Our plan is rather to endeavour to serve our Master and theirs, as we are told they serve Him, with cheerful and willing hearts, with all the faculties of our souls, and during all the days of our existence, and so shall we join them in the bright heaven held out to us, and bask in the light of that Divine countenance before which all clouds of doubt and ignorance shall be dispelled, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

May we all, Roman Catholics and Protestants, who read these lines, join the brilliant host in no matter how humble an order, and unite with them in ascribing glory, honour, and majesty to Him who died and rose again, and now pleads for us on high, the blessed Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world.

## THE TABLES TURNED; OR, WHAT HAPPENED TO LARRY O'DONOVAN ON MONDAY.

### PART II.

LARRY was very well pleased with his Sunday's work, and he began to think that in the wide world there was not such a useful guide for a poor man as Mr. Furniss.

"It is a fine thing," said he to himself, "to have a little education. If I was not able to read, how could all things be so clear to me as they are now that I see them in the book. No wonder the priest is advising everybody to buy 'What Every Christian must Know and Do.'"

The nice new coat he had bought made his old trousers look so shabby, he resolved to thrash some oats at once. In two or three days' time he bought some cloth at his neighbour's shop, and put the materials into the hands of Tom Stack, who promised to have them ready on Monday, the fair day.

Accordingly, he sent his sister Mary over early on that day; and after a little delay, she returned with the wished for article of dress, and Larry proceeded to get ready for a walk through the fair.

When he examined the trousers, he thought them small and skimpy looking, and when he put them on he found them very tight and not nearly long enough. In fact, they did not reach near his ankles. "Oh, murder," said he, "that villain Stack; was there ever such a thing as an honest tailor? and Mr. Carty said I had plenty of the cloth to make them large and roomy."

Boiling with rage, he rushed down street into Stack's house, and accused him of being a plundering villain. "What are you at, at all, at all, to be meddling with my character in that sort of a way?" said the little tailor. "I wonder at you to be so nigh your passion." "No wonder at all," retorted Larry. "Did you ever see such a show as you have made of me?" "Sure if they are a little short," said the tailor, "they'll gather the less mud on a wet day. How do you know but it's the fashion to have them a little tight and short?"

"Fashion, indeed. Maybe you want to have me like one of them savages out in New Zealand. Sure I heard that when some clothes were sent out to them, one of the outlandish fellows mistook a great coat for a pair of breeches, and thrust his legs into the arms and threw the skirts over his shoulders. Do you want to have me like one of them. I've a mind to knock you down for stealing my cloth."

"Steal. Do you take me to be a rogue," shouted the little tailor.

Just at this moment who should pass by but the Rev. Laurence O'Toole, the priest, a fine, tall, clever, elderly gentleman, with such respectable gray hair; none of your hot Maynooth priests, who would settle every dispute with the stick. Hearing the noise he turned into the tailor's house, and asked what was the matter?

"He's just after accusing me of being a thief," said Stack; "and your reverence knows well I have too great a regard for the laws of God and the Church to be any such thing."

"Do you mean to say you put all my cloth into the trousers, and that you kept none?"

"I am no thief, I say."

"Did I not tell ye all to buy that nice little book by Mr. Furniss, and that you could not have a better guide?"

"And so I did, your reverence, and it is my study often; and sure he says it is no sin to keep pieces of cloth whenever there is a common custom of doing it; and sure the book is called 'What Every Christian must Know and Do.' It is not what they may do, but what they must do. So it is clear to me that a Christian tailor must keep the pieces of cloth."

\* Primasius Episc. Utic. Apoc. lib. i., cap. i., fol. 289 D., tom. x. Biblioth. Patrum de la Bigne. Lugd. 1677.

\* Ambrosius Anbertus Comment. in Apoc. lib. i., fol. 414 G., tom. x. Biblioth. Patrum de la Bigne. Lugd. 1677.

\* Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9. \* Mat. xviii. 10. Numb. vi., 25, 26.

Larry seemed a little astounded at this view of the case. He was ashamed of being so angry before the priest, and he calmed down a little, and asked Tom could he add a little to the length of the small clothes.

"I'm sure," said the tailor, "there's a turn up at the end of the legs, and if you send them to me I'll see what I can do."

Larry returned home in very bad humour. "Just think of the holy man putting such a thing in his book. I would not be a bit surprised if his father was a tailor, as he helps the trade in such a way. It's an old saying, give a man an inch and he'll take an ell. The holy father gives the tailor leave to keep the pieces which remain, and Tom took care the pieces should be big enough."

Larry had to content himself with his old pantaloons in his walk through the fair.

Before he returned home in the evening he went to the house of Mr. Griffin, the publican, a very devout man, who was first at the chapel every morning, and every week he made a visit to the Blessed Sacrament.

Larry bought some tea and sugar from him, and as he could not resist the smell of the whiskey, he called for a glass and drank it off. It seemed to him to be very weak, and as if there were something cheaper than spirits in it. However, he said nothing, for when he had been looking into his little book he had seen it was no sin to mix water with spirits if there were a common custom of doing it. "I suppose," said Larry to himself, "a Christian publican must do that, too."

When he reached his house he put the tea and sugar into the cupboard, and went out to walk round the little farm to see if all was right. Half-an-hour was sufficient to make up a few gaps in the walls, and to see there was nothing trespassing in his fields.

Just as he entered the house, he observed his sister Mary, and Tommy his brother, striking their breasts. "What's the matter?" "Not much," said they. "Sure your little book tells us we ought often to make an act of contrition, and strike our breasts." "There's nothing gives me such pleasure," said Larry, "as to see you devout and attending to your duties; and sure it is for that we all join in the Rosary every evening, and after it's over I'll give ye both a little share of tea just now."

Mary looked sad, but said nothing. "Put down the kettle, and after prayers we'll have it comfortable."

About 8 o'clock he made the tea, and looked in the cupboard for the sugar. There was not a grain left. "Ye pair of rogues were ye at the cupboard?" No answer. "Why don't ye speak?" With that he gave Tommy a thump. "Ah, Larry, dear, don't beat me," said Mary. "To be sure I will; I supporting you ever since your father died, and you can't have any behaviour in you." "Ah, Larry, don't be hard on me; don't be harder than the Church would be." "What do you mean, you villain?" "Did not you tell me the other day when I was going to hire with Mrs. Hickson, that if I committed a venial sin, and stole a little, that Father Furniss said I need not be discouraged or vexed at myself, but that I should strike my breast, or at least be sorry for a moment (Rule of Life, ix.), and didn't you see me strike my breast?"

"Don't you know, you rogue, that there's sugar and sugar. It's one thing to steal sugar from a rich Protestant lady, and it's quite another thing to take it from one like me." "Ah, spare me," sobbed out Mary; "indeed you're discouraging me." "And if you hit me again," cried out Tommy, "I'll be vexed at myself, and Mr. Furniss says I should not."

Strange thoughts passed through Larry's mind that night before he went to bed. "The tables are turned upon me. It was all very pleasant when Mr. Furniss was showing me how many things I could do that I liked on Sunday, without mortal sin. How I could dig potatoes, and buy meat, and make money by playing the flute and running a message. Though, to be sure, it does not look like keeping holy the Sabbath day. It's one thing to rob God of his Sabbath day, and quite a different thing to have others rob me of my cloth and my sugar. Yes; and pious Mr. Griffin sold me grog, and called it whiskey."

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER 17, 1857.

THE late Daniel O'Connell used often to boast that he was the best abused man in existence. We believe we may congratulate ourselves upon the privilege of being the best abused periodical. We have so many friends, however, that we can afford to bear abuse, which we are conscious of not meriting, with calmness and equanimity, in the strong belief that the cause of our opponents

must rest on but a sandy foundation, when it can only be defended by misrepresenting its opponents and intimidating its friends.

Out of the two thousand three hundred Roman Catholic priests in Ireland, we regret to think we have, at least, two thousand of the bitterest enemies, who, we have reason to know, seldom lose an opportunity of whispering away the character, maligning the motives, and misrepresenting the contents of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. So far, however, from being either disappointed or angry at the calumnies and falsehoods so studiously propagated against us in private by those who have not the courage to meet us in public, we sincerely thank the Roman Catholic clergy for the substantial assistance which their conduct has afforded us. While their pusillanimity becomes every year more apparent, the courage and independent spirit of their flocks, we have the strongest reason for believing, advances daily; and the steady increase in our circulation, which, within even the last twelve months, has risen from 10,000 to 12,500 copies monthly, proves in the most substantial manner that the only mode of opposition which our priestly opponents have as yet ventured to resort to, and which we believe to have been, indeed, a last resource, has proved a signal failure.

There is another way in which the unmeasured calumny of the Irish priesthood towards our periodical has materially aided us, by opening the eyes of many previously prejudiced against the cause of religious reformation.

There is not, we are sure, a single candid Roman Catholic reader who has ever opened a number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN who, whatever he may think of the soundness of its arguments, has not been, at least, convinced that the statements of the priesthood respecting it are without a shadow of foundation in fact and truth. And let their flocks be once convinced that their priestly guides are striving to deceive them by wilful misrepresentations upon any subject connected with religious inquiry, and we think it not too strong to say, that their power is tottering to its fall, among those, at least, who have no personal interest in upholding it.

In the course of our six years' labours we have succeeded, at least, in raising this great issue with our ecclesiastical opponents, and it is one upon which the people of this country must, and will, one day or other (and, perhaps, at no very distant period) bring in their verdict, viz., whether it is the priests, or whether it is the conductors of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, who are striving to mislead the people of Ireland? If the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland be right, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is a scandalous, malignant, and infamous tissue of libels upon truth and virtue, which deserves not to be reasoned with or refuted, but to be execrated by every sincere Christian and good man, punished with the utmost rigour of a revived Inquisition, and publicly burned by the hands of the common hangman. If the CATHOLIC LAYMAN be right, the religion which the priesthood is striving to rivet on the world, under the pretence of infallibility, is, to say the least of it, one deeply imbued with error, and incapable of bearing the light of free inquiry and dispassionate discussion.

Whichever party be right, two things are plain: the one, that the conductors of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN do not shrink from exposing their opinions and arguments to the test of the fullest examination, and that they invite and facilitate scrutiny by every means possible; the other, that the Roman Catholic priesthood do shrink from examination, and deprecate scrutiny into their claims by every means in their power.

We believe that no intelligent observer will hesitate to pronounce which is the course most

befitting those who are sincerely and intelligently convinced that they are the defenders of truth.

It is now six years since we commenced our attempt to encourage the spirit of free inquiry growing up among our fellow-countrymen, by the establishment of a periodical devoted to what we conscientiously believe to be the cause of religious truth.

We have conducted it in a manner calculated to give the minds of our readers, as well as our own minds, the fullest fair play, by inviting able and learned men on both sides freely to publish to the world the strongest arguments they could produce in favour of their respective opinions, without any restriction but that of merely requiring the combatants on either side to couch their arguments in language as little offensive as possible to the feelings and prejudices of their opponents.

In this spirit we have ever striven to conduct our own labours, and the large amount of support and encouragement we have been favoured with gives us good reason to hope that our aim has been approved of, and also in some degree successful.

We are more deeply persuaded than ever that polemic strife and personal scurrility are not the best means of persuading the world; and we never have resorted—and hope we never shall condescend to resort—to such ignoble expedients of either defending our own opinions or attacking our opponents.

How mortifying, on the other hand, it must be to sincere and thoughtful Roman Catholics that none of their clergy, either priests or prelates, have felt themselves strong enough to attempt a reply to what has, month after month, been brought forward against them in our columns. The affectation of contempt is too thin a disguise, and no longer affords a pretence sufficient to deceive any one of the feeblest intelligence. Be the arguments of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN sound or unsound, learned or unlearned, they are admittedly the most plausible and popular that have ever attracted the attention of the public mind to such grave subjects; and we rejoice to add they have already modified, even where they have not altogether changed, the religious opinions of not a few educated and serious men. None but the wilfully blind now believe that the Roman Catholic priesthood of England and Ireland would have shrunk for six years from a controversy such as the CATHOLIC LAYMAN has invited them to, and so often pressed upon them, if their leaders had not felt conscious that any attempt to meet it would end in discomfiture and disgrace.

Archbishop Cullen, who is well aware of the existence and vast circulation of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, has, however, lately been at Rome, and, doubtless, in conference with the Pope respecting the critical state of Ireland, and the troublesome energy and unexpected vitality of the anti-papal aggressions in operation there. It is possible, therefore, that a change of policy may have been at last decided on, and that we may have a (ROMAN) CATHOLIC CHURCHMAN in support of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, in opposition to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, in support of those of the Reformation. We cannot, of course, pretend to know beforehand what conclusions have been resolved on; but should such a rival (however tardily) present itself in the field, we shall cordially welcome its appearance, as lovers of truth sincerely desirous to hear both sides, and meet it with courtesy and fair play, even though we may not in return experience at its hands either the one or the other.

What an homage it will be, however, to the truth of our periodical, if its opponents should still shrink from any attempt to answer it, after it has, in spite of private threats and altar denun-